UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/769,999	01/25/2001	David A. Seaman	36287-701	5423
	7590 09/15/200 KET ADMINISTRAT	EXAMINER		
LOWENSTEIN SANDLER PC			WEISBERGER, RICHARD C	
65 LIVINGSTON AVENUE ROSELAND, NJ 07068			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
·			3693	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/15/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/769,999	SEAMAN, DAVID A.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Richard C. Weisberger	3693					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06/16</u>	3/2009						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>15-17,19-22,25-27,29-32,57 and 58</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) <u>15-17,19-22,25-27,29-32,57 and 58</u> a	8) Claim(s) 15-17,19-22,25-27,29-32,57 and 58 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
2) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
·— ·— ·—	a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) A) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Discrete of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date							
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application							
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:							

Art Unit: 3693

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

Claims 15-17, 19-22, 57 are drawn to a financial method, classified in class 705, subclass
 35.

II. Claims 25-27,29-32, 58 are, drawn to a financial method, classified in class 705, subclass35.

Inventions I and II are directed to related distinct products. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the invention of group I as claimed requires setting an offering price at a first time for the exchangeable security using the computer system, wherein the offering price is the price of the underlying security from the price source; issuing said exchangeable security; automatically determining at a second time if the time exceeds the minimum holding period using the computer system, and exchanging the underlying security for the exchangeable security; and automatically determining if the second time is at or after said maturity date using the computer system, and crediting the amount of said pre-determined linked payment, while the invention of group II as claimed requires the setting an offering price at a first time for the exchangeable security using the computer system, wherein the offering price is the determined price of the underlying security; issuing said ,exchangeable security; prior to the exchange maturity date, exchanging a full share of the underlying security for a share of the exchangeable security; and prior to the exchange maturity date. declining payment of the amount of said pre-determined linked, payment.

Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above <u>and</u> there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious

Art Unit: 3693

variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of

the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under

35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

A telephone call was made to counsel on September 11, to request an oral election to the above

restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Richard C. Weisberger whose telephone number is 571 272 6753. The examiner can

normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James

Kramer can be reached on 571 272 6783. The fax phone number for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained

from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available

through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer

Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR

CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Richard C Weisberger **Primary Examiner**

Art Unit 3693

/Richard C Weisberger/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3693